To: Daguillard, Robert[Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov]

From: Tina Casey

Sent: Wed 8/12/2015 7:07:50 PM

Subject: Re: Inquiry from Popular Science (popsci.com)

Hi Robert, I don't think that link answers my question after all. I checked into it earlier today and couldn't find the menu line with a link to Gold King. I did find this link (http://www2.epa.gov/region8/upper-animas-mining-district#2), which is how I came across the work being done at Red and Bonita, but I'd like to get the direct link to site history about Gold King.

Thanks again!

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 12, 2015, at 2:34 PM, Daguillard, Robert < <u>Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov</u>> wrote:

Sorry, re-sending.

http://www2.epa.gov/goldkingmine#updates

From: Tina Casey [mailto:tinacasey612@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 2:33 PM

To: Daguillard, Robert

Subject: Re: Inquiry from Popular Science (popsci.com)

Yes, thank you! Please add me to the list. By way of context, my original assignment was to provide our readers with a rundown of the environmental impacts and cleanup, but much of that information is already circulating, so the main thrust of the article will be to sketch out the complexities of multiple mine remediation efforts in the area (I only have 500 words so "sketch" is the right term).

For now it would be most helpful to me if you could send me a link to the EPA site profile and OSC page for Gold King -- there is a lot of search clutter now and I want to make sure I'm looking at the right source.

Also for now, can you let me know if the Gold King spill site is the same one of three mines mentioned in the OSC for the Red and Bonita mine (link below), all of which had an increase in discharge after the Sunnyside mine was plugged (http://www.epaosc.org/site/site_profile.aspx?site_id=8417). I'll send a short list of questions later today. Thanks in advance for your help! T. Sent from my iPhone On Aug 12, 2015, at 1:25 PM, Daguillard, Robert < <u>Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov</u>> wrote: Good afternoon all and thanks to Julia for forwarding, Tina, I would be happy to help with your question on the Gold King mine, but it'll probably be very difficult to put you on the phone with anybody, salready have so much inquiries coming in and Administrator McCarthy is visiting the area today. I'd suggest the following: Can you forward us a list of questions? I doubt we'll get to them today, but I understand we're trying to put out a Q and A on this incident. I'll add you to our media list so you can receive our updates and statements, including the one that will follow Administrator McCarthy's media availability this afternoon.

Best. R.

I hope this helps. Let me know.

From: Valentine, Julia

Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 12:58 PM

To: Tina Casey; Daguillard, Robert

Subject: RE: Inquiry from Popular Science (popsci.com)

Hi Tina,

My colleague Robert Daguillard can help. I have copied him here.

Julia P. Valentine

Office of Public Affairs

U.S. EPA

202.564.2663 direct

202.740.1336 m/txt

From: Tina Casey [mailto:tinacasey612@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 12:57 PM

To: Valentine, Julia

Subject: Fwd: Inquiry from Popular Science (popsci.com)

Good afternoon, Julia. I'm a freelance writer on assignment for Popular Science (popsci.com), and I was referred to you from the main EPA media office. I'm following up on last week's mine waste spill in a broader context, specifically regarding remediation work at another mine in the area several years ago. I sent a note to EPA's Region 8 office this morning (see thread below) and I haven't hear back yet -- understandable, I'm sure they're very busy. Would you be able to help me connect with someone later today, or tomorrow? You can reply to this email or text (or call) my cell, 908-377-4505.

Thank you!

Tina Casey

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tina Casey < tinacasey612@gmail.com>
Date: August 12, 2015 at 8:18:52 AM EDT

To: mylott.richard@epa.gov, way.Steven@epa.gov Subject: Inquiry from Popular Science (popsci.com)

Good morning, Richard. I am a freelance science/technology writer on assignment for PopSci.com, with a deadline this Friday. I understand you must be very busy this week and I'm hoping that you or someone in your office can spare a few minutes to discuss the August 5 mining waste release, in the context of other cleanup work conducted in the area a number of years ago.

Specifically, I am interested in the connection between the increase in discharge from Red and Bonita, as well as two other mines, after remediation work at Sunnyside. I would like to speak with someone who can confirm the information on Steven Way's site profile (the link and relevant passage are below).

I would also like to speak with someone who can confirm the work hazards involved during site investigation at Red and Bonita, as described in the profile.

I expect that these two topics will take up the bulk of my article (I think the impact of the spill is being adequately covered elsewhere!).

If you can get back to me any time today or Thursday that would be great. You can call or text my cell, 908-377-4505, or reply to this email, tinacasey612@gmail.com.

To confirm my assignment, please contact my editor Carl Franzen, carl.franzen@popsci.com.

My freelance science/technoogy writing includes more than 1,000 articles since 2009, mainly for <u>CleanTechnica.com</u> and also for <u>TriplePundit.com</u> and <u>TalkingPointsMemo.com</u>. My complete archive is available via Twitter, https://twitter.com/TinaMCasey.

Thank you in advance for your time.

Tina Casey

http://www.epaosc.org/site/site_profile.aspx?site_id=8417

Several other mines in the Cement Creek basin also have draining adits. The discharge from Red and Bonita Mine, Gold King (Level 7) Mine, and Mogul Mine all experienced significant increases in flow following the plugging of the Sunnyside Gold Mine workings, including the American Tunnel, that occurred between 1998 and 2002. The Red and Bonita Mine was essentially dry during the period when the Sunnyside Gold Mine operated with an estimated flow of five gpm. Flow from the American Tunnel was reported to be approximately 1,700 gpm when it was treated, prior to the final bulkhead installation. Active water treatment also was discontinued. Water quality in the Animas River has degraded progressively since that time.